

The Wilmington Post.

VOLUME VI.

WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA, FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1875.

NUMBER 30

We publish to-day the decision of the Supreme Court on the city charter case. It had been generally given up by the VanBokkelen Board some weeks before the decision was rendered. They and their lawyers knew it was unconstitutional, and the telegram announcing the decision gave but little surprise.

Nearly all the leading Democratic lawyers of the State were of the opinion that the act was unconstitutional, as soon as they knew the points. In this city, of the six lawyers consulted by the Democratic committee who had charge of the infamous bill, three of them gave it as their opinion that the bill was unconstitutional. We were informed by some of the best Democratic attorneys in the city that the bill would not hold water.

The decision of the court gives general satisfaction among the white people of this city; they look upon it as a vindication of their rights at the ballot box, and we hope the Democratic papers will publish the decision, and keep it standing until the August election for convention delegates.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR.

JAMES W. BURGESS, CHARGED WITH THE MURDER OF CHAS. JACKSON, CLEARED.—Some time during the first of June, one Charles Jackson, a negro, was killed; shot, two ball holes in his person. The evidence was that one Charles Snow and James W. Burgess were fighting Jackson one minute before he was shot. These two men were arrested, and the evidence considered so very conclusive that it would hardly admit of a doubt of the guilt of Burgess, who has just been tried; but notwithstanding the evidence, the jury, who are all white men, found him not guilty. We must confess that we are ashamed of the verdict. In the metropolis of the State, a colored man is killed by two white men, and one of the men who commenced the fight, and instrumental in bringing on the difficulty, is cleared by a white jury. We think it shows what we have been saying all along, that you cannot hang a white man in North Carolina for killing a negro—there is not a single case on record.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR. This gentleman has finally consented, through the solicitations of his many friends to become a candidate for the Convention in Brunswick county. All who know Mr. Taylor respect him for his honesty and integrity, and his unwavering character is unblemished. He is truly a self made man, and one who the people and the poor man can trust with his rights, having been raised in North Carolina himself, he knows the many ways the democracy can devise to degrade a poor white man, and fully appreciates the necessity of preventing them; the lawyers, democrats and aristocrats from getting control of the fundamental law's of this State. Should they have a majority in the Convention then the people may expect no favors. But Brunswick county will be truly and ably represented if Mr. Edward W. Taylor is elected.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR. This gentleman is the worthy citizen, who by his heroic conduct as to the city hall, is deserving of the fullest trust and confidence of the people of this commonwealth.

The subscription price to THE WILMINGTON POST is \$3 00 per year for single copies; for clubs of 10 or 20 \$2 00 per copy. The circulation of the POST is the largest of any paper in North Carolina.

CITY ITEMS.

All communications on business should be addressed to THE WILMINGTON POST, Wilmington, N. C.

One of our friends suggests that the first business before the Convention when it meets, should be to immediately pass an ordinance of secession. That is what they will do, if the Democrats have the majority.

The subscription price to THE WILMINGTON POST is \$3 00 per year for single copies; for clubs of 10 or 20 \$2 00 per copy. The circulation of the POST is the largest of any paper in North Carolina.

Owing to the many calls made on us for the POST in which was our editorial on the Address of the Democratic State Executive Committee, we to-day re-published the same, which will be found on our fourth page.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS.—One thousand dollars have been subscribed in this city, as a fund to be used for the purpose of prosecuting all those poll-holders and others who may illegally disenfranchise or attempt to disenfranchise legal voters in their right to express their opinions at the ballot box.

Any and every voter who may be deterred from voting on election day, or on whose offering to vote his ballot should be rejected for improper reasons, should at once communicate the full facts of the case to the Wilmington POST, and the offender or offenders will receive such prompt attention as will ensure their being punished for their offense.

ELECTION LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

Sec. 2d, of the election law.

That when a voter is challenged at the polls, upon demand of any citizen of the State, it shall be the duty of the inspectors of the election to require said voter, before being allowed to vote, to prove by the oath of some other person known to the Judges, the fact of his residence for thirty days previous thereto in the county in which he proposes to vote.

The above Supreme Court has decided, in its decision, July 6th, 1875, to be unconstitutional.

If any person should be disenfranchised by a poll holder, on account of the above unconstitutional law, the poll holder should be at once arrested and properly punished.

THE FOURTH AT ABBOTTSBURG.—The citizens of Abbottsbury without respect to party, joined heartily in the celebration of the glorious Fourth. In the morning the national banner was thrown to the breeze from the cupola of the Fremont House, and guns were fired. At 3 o'clock a large number of citizens collected with only a brief notice. H. S. Serres, Esq., called the meeting to order, and nominated Gen. Abbott as Chairman. John Nutt, Esq., was then elected Secretary. The ceremonies were then commenced by prayer by Rev. J. W. Gurganus, after which J. W. Rowell, Esq., was introduced, who read the Declaration of Independence. The meeting then broke up with three enthusiastic cheers for "our country and its flag."

GOLDBORO, July 7th, 1875.
Editor Wilmington Post:

Green county matters are all right. Jos. Dixon has been nominated for Convention. They had a hard fight for him but conquered about midnight. I hear that all parties are satisfied, and that the prospects are fair for a good majority against Convention.

Yours truly, G.

TOWN CREEK, BRUNSWICK Co., N. C., JULY 6th, 1875.

Having at the request of my friends, consented to become the candidate of my party for a seat in the State Convention, I hereby make my acceptance public, and will address the people at Bolton, July 8th; Brinkleys, July 9th; Farmers' Turnout, July 10th; Gay's Store, July 12th; Town Creek, July 14. Other appointments will be made hereafter.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR.

JAMES W. BURGESS, CHARGED WITH THE MURDER OF CHAS. JACKSON, CLEARED.—Some time during the first of June, one Charles Jackson, a negro, was killed; shot, two ball holes in his person. The evidence was that one Charles Snow and James W. Burgess were fighting Jackson one minute before he was shot. These two men were arrested, and the evidence considered so very conclusive that it would hardly admit of a doubt of the guilt of Burgess, who has just been tried; but notwithstanding the evidence, the jury, who are all white men, found him not guilty. We must confess that we are ashamed of the verdict. In the metropolis of the State, a colored man is killed by two white men, and one of the men who commenced the fight, and instrumental in bringing on the difficulty, is cleared by a white jury. We think it shows what we have been saying all along, that you cannot hang a white man in North Carolina for killing a negro—there is not a single case on record.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR. This gentleman has finally consented, through the solicitations of his many friends to become a candidate for the Convention in Brunswick county. All who know Mr. Taylor respect him for his honesty and integrity, and his unwavering character is unblemished. He is truly a self made man, and one who the people and the poor man can trust with his rights, having been raised in North Carolina himself, he knows the many ways the democracy can devise to degrade a poor white man, and fully appreciates the necessity of preventing them; the lawyers, democrats and aristocrats from getting control of the fundamental law's of this State. Should they have a majority in the Convention then the people may expect no favors. But Brunswick county will be truly and ably represented if Mr. Edward W. Taylor is elected.

EDWARD W. TAYLOR. This gentleman is the worthy citizen, who by his heroic conduct as to the city hall, is deserving of the fullest trust and confidence of the people of this commonwealth.

The subscription price to THE WILMINGTON POST is \$3 00 per year for single copies; for clubs of 10 or 20 \$2 00 per copy. The circulation of the POST is the largest of any paper in North Carolina.

I wish to purchase a good milk Cow. Persons wishing to sell will please apply to Robert Kennedy, office of THE WILMINGTON POST.

Grand Republican Demonstration in Honor of the Decision of the Supreme Court with Reference to the CITY BILL.

The strains of music which floated along the tranquil air augmented the immense gathering already brought out by a sense of their gratitude to God for this blessing of redemption from the effect of Democratic misrule.

T. M. Gardner, Esq., was made chairman of the meeting, and Hon. James A. Lowry, secretary.

Smyth, in his usual style, made an earnest and vigorous speech, in which the Supreme Court, Hon. D. L. Russell, and Hon. W. P. Canaday received full mead of praise; the Court for the decision made, Russell for the ability displayed in the advocacy of the rights of the people, and Canady for the pluck, of which he is known to possess a large share.

A series of resolutions were reported from committee, consisting of J. H. Smyth, Jas. A. Lowry, and Geo. W. Price, Jr. They were as follows:

In these times of change, doubt, and uncertainty, it is cheering to receive assurance that as a people we are not forgotten. To know by the conduct of our friends that they have at last concluded that liberty for us, as for all men, is enjoyable in proportion to the protection vouchsafed through a wise and fearless administration of the law.

Resolved, That we have, in the Supreme Judiciary of the nation, and in our State judiciary, men no less distinguished for integrity than rare and varied legal learning; guided by the law they decide; question that come before them without fear or favor, reward or hope of reward." May God bless each and every one of them.

Resolved, That in Hon. D. L. Russell the people of North Carolina have an advocate upon whom they may always rely as being just and honest.

Resolved, That Hon. W. P. Canaday, Mayor of Wilmington, is a worthy citizen, who by his heroic conduct as to the city hall, is deserving of the fullest trust and confidence of the people of the town.

Dr. Cook, on taking the Chair, explained the object of the meeting in a few appropriate and well-timed remarks.

On motion of A. Wilkes, a committee of seven were appointed to draft resolutions suitable for the occasion, to wit:—H. Hays, Chairman, R. M. Smith, A. Winkler, I. S. Catl, T. J. Dula, and A. L. Hendrix.

On motion, the several Townships was called, and all being represented but two, the Convention proceeded to ballot for candidates, which resulted in the selection of Col. T. J. Dula and Gen. J. Q. A. Bryan, which was made unanimous, as our standard bearers in the coming contest. It was then moved that A. Wiles, A. L. Hendrix and R. M. Smith, be appointed a committee to wait on the gentlemen nominated, and inform them of their nomination; who appeared and accepted the nominations tendered them.

Col. T. J. Dula, was first called to the stand, and in a telling and interesting speech returned his warmest thanks to his friends for the honor bestowed upon him. He referred in the warmest terms, to the fact that this was the third time the people of Wilkes had honored him with their confidence, and pledged himself to be in the future, as in the past, faithful to the trust they had been pleased to repose in him. He referred to his record in the late General Assembly, and especially to the action of the late legislature in calling a Convention, and showed to the satisfaction of every one present, that he was justifiable in opposing this revolutionary movement which is now agitating the country.—He showed with much force the dark and hidden intentions of the Democratic party, in thus endeavoring to force upon the people this obnoxious measure.—During the course of his remarks on the Convention, he propounded the question, "Do the people want a Convention?" And the great excitement, and loud responses of "Yes! Yes!" No! sounded through the house, followed by three prolonged cheers. His speech was listened to throughout with special attention. It was one of the Colonel's finest speeches, and was truly a success.

Gen. Bryan next appeared upon the stand amid the loud buzzes and shouts of applause of the large and enthusiastic assemblage that thronged the Court House almost to overflowing.—His speech was short, but pointed and interesting. In his speech he said that the text of the Democratic party in this campaign would be "civil rights" and internal revenue, but on the main issue of the day, they would scarcely touch at all. He showed conclusively that the Democratic party were wholly responsible for the present high taxes, both State and national, having brought on the late rebellion, and having had continual control of the State Legislature ever since the war, with one exception.

Gen. Bryan is a true and forcible Tripartite Republican—has the united confidence of the people, and will win his colleague, without doubt, be triumphantly elected on the first Thursday in August, by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. R. D. Horton, being present, was called upon, and addressed the meeting in a very appropriate speech, endorsing the action of the convention and pledging the ticket his hearty support.

Dr. C. L. Cook, was next called upon and addressed the meeting in an able and eloquent speech, which notwithstanding it was getting late, was listened to with attention. The Doctor

when the procession will reform and march with invited guest to the City Hall, and partake of refreshments.

By order of Sol. BEAR,
Chief Marshal.

The last we saw of the procession was

tended to with attention. The Doctor

wish to purchase a good milk Cow. Persons wishing to sell will please apply to Robert Kennedy, office of THE WILMINGTON POST.

Grand Ratification Mass Meeting Market Front.

June 6th, 1875.

Meeting called to order. Whereupon Jos. C. Hill was chosen Chairman, who responded in a few brief remarks.

Mr. Wright, was appointed as the Secretary.

There was an immense gathering of over one thousand solid Republicans on the field.

The first Speaker was Gen. S. H. Manning, who made a powerful speech against Convention and Democratic rule.

Amid the blazing of the bright bonfires and loud huzzas of the multitude, the scene was sublime. Mr. John H. Smyth, that able master-piece of eloquence, who entertained the assemblage for an hour and a half in an able and well timed speech, which was continually received with rousing applause.

Good order prevailed throughout. Resolutions were endorsed ratifying the nomination made in the late Convention.

Jos. C. Hill, Chairman.

Republican Convention in Wilkes County.

Pursuant to previous notice, the Republicans of Wilkes county in convention assembled, reaffirming their adhesion to the principles of the Great Union Republican party of the county, and pledge to it our united support in the future. And that we are unanimously opposed to the act of the late General Assembly of North Carolina in calling a convention without submitting the question to the people, and regarding the question as a political question, and are resolved to elect delegates to said convention who will not pledge themselves before the people to move and immediately move for adjournment, without making any alterations of the Constitution, or cost to the people.

Resolved, Further, that we the Republicans of Wilkes county having been informed that our late Representative, James H. Foote, did, while a member of the last Legislature, betray the trust reposed in him by the Republican party, we therefore demand his resignation as a member of the said General Assembly, to the end, that some true Republican may be elected, who will not betray their confidence.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this convention be published in the States-American, and other Republican papers throughout the State are requested to copy.

On motion, the convention adjourned.

C. L. Cook, Chairman.

W. F. PORTER, Secretary.

OPINION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE CITY CHURCH CASE.

Supreme Court June Term,

The people and A. H. Venable, et al., vs. W. P. Canaday, et al.

OPINION.

Our Government is founded on the will of the people. Their will is expressed by the ballot. The ballot embraces every citizen twenty-one years old, who has had a residence in the State for twelve months, and in the city or town for thirty days. Again, the Act provides that before an election there shall be a registration of voters; and only those who register can vote. The first ward is made a registration and election precinct, and to the second. The third ward is divided by metes and bounds into four precincts. Of course every voter must register in the ward in the precinct where he lives, and at no other, and must vote where he registers. The object being to prevent frauds by "repeating." But a large portion of the third ward (on the west side of the river) was, by mistake probably, included in any of the precincts. And of course they cannot register or vote. And *Perpetrators against Whisker*, 71 N. C., is an express decision that that makes the election void.

Indeed it would seem that the registration provision for such parts of the city as are embraced are so impracticable as to amount to disfranchisement of the voters. The Constitution ordains that the General Assembly shall provide for the registration of voters, and that "no one shall vote without registration." (Art. 6, Sec. 2.) This means that the General Assembly shall provide the convenience and necessities so that the voters can register. It is to facilitate the exercise of the right of the ballot and not to defeat it. It is true that this includes the power and the duty to protect the ballot from fraud, and therefore our general election law provides that when a voter offers to register or vote he may be challenged and required to take an oath to his qualifications. And so in our general law regulating town elections, (Battle's Revision). There can be no objection to that; and it prevents no man from voting and puts him to no inconvenience. If a man will swear that he has the qualifications, then he can register or vote, unless it can be proved against him that he is not entitled; and in that case he can be rejected. But the act under consideration is based upon the idea of making the ballot as difficult as possible. Indeed it makes it impracticable. It provides that any elector may, and it shall be the duty of the registrar to challenge the rights of any person to register known or suspected not to be lawfully entitled to register; and when such person to prove the fact of the registrars of his being of lawful age to vote, the fact of his residence for twelve months in the State, and for ninety days in the lot, &c. It will be noted that any bystander may challenge the voter, and the voter is not allowed to swear to his qualifications; but he must prove them by the oaths of others and these others must be known to the registrar and the registrar must be satisfied. Now, how is it possible for persons who move into Wilmington from other counties of the State to get witnesses from a distance known to the registrar in Wilmington, to prove their age and their residence? It is impossible.

It is a practical denial of the right to register and vote.

It has already been said that towns and cities are but parts and parcels of the State for the convenience of local self-government, and that the voters and the rights of voters are the same as in the State government.

A fundamental principle in the State government is, that representation shall be apportioned to the popular vote as near as may be.

Large counties and small ones; so that not only every man may vote, but his vote shall count in the representative body.

The act creates a representative legislative body, Board of nine Aldermen, for the city of Wilmington. Now, if every voter could vote for all of the

houses of Congress, the result would be that the whole State would be represented in Congress, and the whole State would be represented in the Senate.

But this is not the case, and the result is that the whole State is not represented in either house.

Now, if the whole State were represented in the Senate, the result would be that the whole State would be represented in the Senate.

But this is not the case, and the result is that the whole State is not represented in either house.

Now, if the whole State were represented in the Senate, the result would be that the whole State would be represented in the Senate.

But this is not the case, and the result is that the whole State is not represented in either house.

Now,

THE WEEKLY POST
WILMINGTON, N. C.
FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1875.

THE ADDRESS OF THE DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REVIEWED.

The Democratic mountain has labored and at length brought forth its mouse beyond question, the address of the Democratic Executive Committee is the weakest instrument ever put forth by the managers of a party for its guidance in an important campaign. When we look over the names of the committee for the paternity of this sickly bantling, we must confess we cannot find one to whom we should not consider it a personal affront to attribute the authorship. Can it be that some fossilized Miss Nancy of the party has foisted on the Committee the child of his dudge, or is this, in truth, the best showing that such men as Gen. Cox W. N. H. Smith, Davis, Battle, and their colleagues can make in favor of the Convention called by the Democratic party.

DODGING THE ISSUE.

Many thoughtful citizens of the State who were waiting for this address, expecting to find a candid statement of the evils attending the present Constitution of such great and overwhelming necessity as to require the sharp remedy of a constitutional convention, will be surprised to find the address setting out with the declaration that "the necessity for changing many portions of the present Constitution is too apparent to require extended argument." We are therefore prepared beforehand for the paucity of reasoning which appears throughout the paper. They enter a judgment against themselves by confession at the outset. Who ever heard before of a justification for a party's conduct being "too strong" to be stated in its most glaring colors in the bulletin by which it seeks to inspire its forces with the hope or certitude of victory? It could not be. The subterfuge lacks thickness, to say the least.

THE FIRST REASON GIVEN

for the call of a convention at this time, is equally remarkable with the admission just noticed. It is, substantially, that some of the prominent men of the Democratic party at one time opposed the call of a Convention and now do not.

In other words, the revolutionists of the Conservative party having whipped the wiser and better portion of the prominent men of their own party into silence and submission, it is the bound-duty of the State to submit also.

"SOCIOLISTS AND ADVENTURERS."

The next reason given for the disjunction of the present Constitution is peculiarly Pecksniffian in its character as to make the authorship of the document almost beyond a peradventure. No one but the antediluvian sage who has been restituted to make the race with crazy Joe in Orange could have been guilty of such lexicologic enormity as to denominate the authors of the Constitution "sociolists." The passage is, however, worthy of notice as showing the spirit which underlies present movement. The authors of the Constitution are by it divided into three classes:

1st. "They were mainly sociolists and adventurers who had lived among us without prefferment, or possessed of the qualities entitling them to it."

2. "Others were our recent slaves, who had known no law save the will of the master, and

3d. "Others still were carpet baggers black and white."

There is the milk in the cocomut! The Constitution was framed by "sociolists"—pretenders, usurpers—"and adventurers who had lived among us without prefferment!" That is its first mortal offence. The aristocracy, the prescriptive rulers of the State, those who were born to command all within the borders were not permitted to dictate its terms. In plain words it means that the people made it and not the old politicians. Think of a constitution not tinkered by a Graham! Down with one made by "sociolists" and "adventurers" who have lived without prefferment." What has been done by men who have never held office before, is only fit to be undone by these divinely appointed ones for whose comfort and emolument "poor whites" and "niggers" were created. "sociolists and adventurers" make a constitution for North Carolina, forsooth! And niggers and carpet baggers help them? It is "too apparent" that it should be overthrown!

EIGHTY THOUSAND NEGROES.

The next reason given is equally statesmanlike and weighty. It shows, however, not a little of the intention of the present movement. "Over eighty thousand ignorant negroes were given the ballot to secure its adoption!" The inference is unavoidable that any instrument for which negroes voted should be torn up, whatever its character! The eighty thousand ignorant negroes will do well to see to it that they send men to this convention who will at least give them a chance to vote on its worth. The address clearly shows that the conservative party have no such intention. Just here it may be well to note that both the grammar and arithmetic of this paper are peculiar. Instance: "Over eighty thousand negroes!"

THE EARLIEST OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE.

The address says, with an admirable disregard for the truth which only a man born to govern "sociolists and adventurers" who have lived without prefferment" could so coolly assume, that "it is natural that we (the conservative party) should embrace the earliest opportunity consistent with reason and prudence to secure such changes." As if the same party had not moved heaven and earth, and if the Ku Klux had not stirred up hell itself, only four years ago, in the endeavor to coax, wheedle, lie or drive the people of the State into calling a convention for this very purpose! The earliest opportunity! They know that the call of a convention by legislative action was a fraud upon the people—a usurpation of authority, an act which every man who voted for it had pledged himself on the stamp to oppose a condition precedent to his election! The earliest opportunity! As if the party had not been in power for years and had not used it every time they dared go before the people with the idea! As if this call for a convention was the spontaneous act of the people instead of the trick of a party who denied with the utmost

indignation the imputation of any such motive during the legislative canvas of one year ago! The earliest opportunity! It would have been more appropriate and truthful if they had said instead—"The last opportunity."

THE CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS.

The Democratic mountain has labored and at length brought forth its mouse beyond question, the address of the Democratic Executive Committee is the weakest instrument ever put forth by the managers of a party for its guidance in an important campaign. When we look over the names of the committee for the paternity of this sickly bantling, we must confess we cannot find one to whom we should not consider it a personal affront to attribute the authorship. Can it be that some fossilized Miss Nancy of the party has foisted on the Committee the child of his dudge, or is this, in truth, the best showing that such men as Gen. Cox W. N. H. Smith, Davis, Battle, and their colleagues can make in favor of the Convention called by the Democratic party.

AS ANOTHER ILLUSTRATION OF THE SPIRIT OF THIS MOVEMENT, THIS REFERENCE TO THE PAST IS VALUABLE, AND THE MORE SO AS IT IS AN UNINTENTIONAL AND UNAWARE EXPOSITION OF THAT SPIRIT. THOSE WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE FACTS OF THAT PERIOD CAN WELL REMEMBER WHEN JOHN THE FAT, THE SON OF WILLIAM THE LEAN, OF ORANGE, ROSE IN THE CONVENTION, AND LAYING ONE HAND CARESSINGLY ACROSS HIS ABDOMINAL PROTuberance, TURNED OUT HIS UNDER LIP AND PROCEEDED TO ANNOUNCE THE PLATFORM WHICH HAS BEEN RECEIVED UPON THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT WAS HARDLY CHANGED EXCEPT IN NAME. THE WAR OF THE REVOLUTION WAS A STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE RATHER THAN PERSONAL LIBERTY. NO AMERICAN CITIZEN CLAIMED AT ITS BEGINNING ANY RIGHTS SAVE WHAT HE SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED UNDER THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION, NOR IN THIS STATE DID HE RECEIVE ANY OTHER STATEMENT, THEY SIMPLY LEAVE OUT OF CONSIDERATION WHAT MIGHT REASONABLY AND PROPERLY AMOUNT TO THE FACT, IF THEIR ASSERTION WERE TRUE. THE CONSTITUTION OF 1776, THE RESULT OF THE RENUNCIATION OF ENGLISH RULE, SCARCELY REFLECTED THE PERSONAL RELATIONS OF THE CITIZENS AT ALL. THE